



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,906	02/12/2002	Reijo Lylykangas	3502-1008	3661
466	7590	11/29/2006	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief  
(37 CFR 41.37)**

Application No.

10/072,906

Applicant(s)

LYLYKANGAS ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer A. Leung

Art Unit

1764

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

The Appeal Brief filed on 30 August 2006 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.  
**EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

See Continuation Sheet.

**Continuation of 10. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):**

1. The paragraph citations under the Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (Item 5 of the brief) should be changed to line citations.
2. The statements of the Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal should be restated as, for example, "Whether claims 27 and 30-31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Usui (US 5,620,666) in view of Kono et al. (US 5,403,558) and Chapman et al. (US 4,331,631)," etc.
3. The arguments section should contain separate headings for each of the five grounds of rejection stated under item 6 of the brief.

For each ground of rejection applying to two or more claims, the claims may be argued separately or as a group. When multiple claims subject to the same ground of rejection are argued as a group by appellant, the Board may select a single claim from the group of claims that are argued together to decide the appeal with respect to the group of claims as to the ground of rejection on the basis of the selected claim alone. The failure of appellant to separately argue claims which appellant has grouped together constitutes a waiver of any argument that the Board must consider the patentability of any grouped claim separately. *See In re McDaniel*, 293 F.3d 1379, 1384, 63 USPQ2d 1462, 1465-66 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Any claim argued separately should be placed under a subheading identifying the claim by number. Claims argued as a group should be placed under a subheading identifying the claims by number.

For example, if Claims 1 to 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. Y and appellant is only going to argue the limitations of independent claim 1, and thereby group dependent claims 2 to 5 to stand or fall with independent claim 1, then one possible heading as required by this subsection could be "Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. Y" and the optional subheading would be "Claims 1 to 5." Another example is where claims 1 to 3 stand


Art Unit: 1764


rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. Z and appellant wishes to argue separately the patentability of each claim, a possible heading as required by this subsection could be "Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) over U.S. Patent No. Z," and the optional subheadings would be "Claim 1," "Claim 2 " and "Claim 3." Under each subheading the appellant would present the argument for patentability of that claim. The best practice is to use a subheading for each claim for which separate consideration by the Board is desired.

4. The arguments section contains arguments directed towards objections to the specification (see page 7, paragraphs 1 and 2). These arguments should be removed, because objections to the specification are not appealable.

In general, that portion of the Examiner's action pertaining to objections on formal matters may be reviewed by petition to the Director of the USPTO (see MPEP § 1002), and that portion of the Examiner's action pertaining to the rejection of claims on the merits may be reviewed by appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (see MPEP § 1201). The distinction is set forth in 37 CFR 1.181 and 1.191.

Jennifer A. Leung

November 26, 2006 

  
Jennifer A. Leung  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1700